Remarks

The referenced patent application has been reviewed in light of the referenced Office Action.

Claims 1-15 are pending in the referenced patent application. Claims 1-15 are rejected by the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent 6,384,840 (Frank et. al) in view of United States Patent 6,348,953 (Rybczynski). Reconsideration of the referenced patent application in view of the above claim amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 11 and 13 are amended to clarify the claimed subject matter.

On page 2, the Office Action asserts that Frank et al. discloses creating a first window to receive video, referring to figure 8 and to col. 9, lines 47-62. However, neither the figure nor the text referenced disclose or suggest a window to receive dynamic video content, reciting Applicant's claim 1 as amended in pertinent part. Moreover, the reception of dynamic video content is not disclosed nor suggested by any part of Frank et al. Further, Rybczynski does not anywhere disclose or suggest a window to receive dynamic video content. Since neither Frank et al. nor Rybczynski disclose or suggest this element of Applicant's claim 1 as amended, and further because the Office Action fails to argue that either reference discloses or suggests this element, Applicant therefore asserts that claim 1 is patentable over Frank et al. in view of Rbczynski. Since the referenced element of claim 1 is present in all claims dependent on claim 1, i.e. claims 2-6, as well as in claim 7 and in all claims dependent on claim 7, i.e. claims 8-10, claims 1-10 as amended are patentable over Frank et al. in view of Rbczynski.

On page 3, the Office Action asserts Rybczynski teaches rendering video only to areas of the region of overlap which have the chroma color, an element of applicant's claim 11, referring

to col. 2, lines 35-60. However, the text referenced nowhere discloses or suggests rendering *dynamic video content* only to areas of the region of overlap [on a display], (emphasis added) as recited in Applicant's claim 11 as amended; nor does Frank et al. anywhere disclose or suggest this limitation. In order to bridge this gap, the Office Action asserts that a "video screen is a type of window.:" However, Frank et al. and Rybczynski separately or in combination nowhere disclose or suggest that a "video screen is a type of window." Furthermore, no convincing line of reasoning based in the cited art is provided in the Office Action for the Examiner to conclude that Frank et al. and Rbczynski either separately or in combination disclose or suggest that a "video screen is a type of window." Applicant therefore asserts that claim 11 is patentable over Frank et al. in view of Rbczynski. Since the referenced element of claim 11 is present in all claims dependent on claim 1, i.e. claims 12-15, claims 11-15 are patentable over Frank et al. in view of Rbczynski.

In the section entitled "Response to Arguments" the Office Action asserts that Frank discloses a window to receive video because of a reference in Frank et al. to a "video memory for the display." A reference to "video memory" does not disclose or suggest either a window to receive dynamic video content , the element of claim 1 discussed above, or rendering dynamic video content only to areas of the region of overlap, the element of claim 11 discussed above. Applicant therefore respectfully asserts that the Examiner's Response to Arguments is unpersuasive.

Applicant therefore asserts that all claims pending in the application, claims 1-15, are therefore patentable over Frank et al. in view of Rybczynski and should be allowed.

The Examiner is welcome to contact the Attorney of Record, Gregory D. Caldwell (Reg. No. 39,926) at 503 684 6200 to discuss any matters with the case. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees in connection with this communication to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: March 28, 2003

Paul A. Mendonsa
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(503) 684-6200

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on:

March 28, 2003
Date of Deposit

Angie C. Farr
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

Angie C. Farr 3/28/03
Signature *Date*